

Evaluation Portal > Schedule > Pages > PRC-HMLMatrix.aspx

This Site: Schedule

## HIGH - PRC **EARLY COMPLETION**

# **Evaluation Criteria** — Completing the Project quickly and efficiently

Edit Facts



Segment Completion Dates:

First Segment - June 30, 2012

Second Segment - December 30, 2012

Project Completion January 29, 2013

689 days ahead of schedule

Significant Strengths



• Entire project completed for public use by December 30, 2012, which is a little less than 24 months prior to the Department's "no later than" completion date of December 19, 2014.

Minor Strengths

• Committed to use of ABC on the Project and SPMT methods specifically at 500 East and Sam White Lane structures will reduce impacts to the public.

#### Minor Weaknesses

- Did not fully develop or demonstrate an efficient plan that sequenced key usable portions (Segments) of Work. Specifically, Pleasant Grove Blvd to Spanish Fork is under construction for the full duration of the Project. Working the majority of the corridor at the same time increases the amount of time the public is impacted and does not capture intent of the Project goals and values of releasing portions early to the advantage of the public. · Risk assessment for accomplishing this scheduled Work - Schedule compression has final Segment (83% of the Project) completion December 30, 2012. Any project delay would roll this schedule into another construction season. Areas of concern for weather sensitive construction are as follows:
- Potential for snow covering the majority of the Work, difficult to cover and uncover Work areas for construction and inspection activities
- Frozen subgrade during winter paving operations could significantly impact production rates
- Cold weather concrete work result in additional production rate challenges
- Landscaping Window (Apr 15th to Oct 15th); Usually this is the last activity for Segment Completion
- Specific temperature requirements for Structural Painting, Pavement Markings, Polymer Overlays, and HMA (including any SMA or bonded wearing courses) tie-ins and transitions

# **USABLE SEGMENTS**

**Evaluation Criteria** — Completion of Segments that improve regional mobility and provide major regional arterial connectivity



Project in two Segments, north to south with completion dates (completed for use by public) included:

- 1. Segment 1 North terminus to north side of Pleasant Grove interchange; Completion by June 30, 2012 (28 months - 3/10 to 6/30/12)
- 2. Segment 2 (Pleasant Grove interchange to the South terminus): 03/10 to 12/30/12

Regional mobility narrative [3.3.2.2]

- 1. Maintaining current number of lanes during construction.
- 2. Completing segments from the North (where traffic volumes are greatest) and progress to the South.
- 3. Segment 1: Lehi Main Street SPUI provides LOS C/D in 2030, not just LOS D in 2020. 500 East Diverging Diamond. ABC techniques. New crossing at Sam White Lane for eastwest connectivity across I-15.
- 4. Segment 2: University Parkway/Sandhill road CFI. LOS D. CFI picked over gradeseparation for shorter duration (one construction season versus two). Provo Center Street rotary interchange LOS A for 2030. Does not require closure of Provo Center Street. US6/Spanish Fork Main, LOS B/C in 2030, not just D in 2020. Construction of additional GP lane and HOV lane in each direction from Provo Center Street to US6, 76% reduction in delays, as measured by I-15 travel time reduction for peak hour directional traffic flow as compared to No-Build conditions.



Significant Strengths

• Completion of the entire Project for public use by December 30, 2012 has a considerable positive influence in advancing this Department value. The early completion of the Project delivers the highest congested area of the project, which is Provo Center Street thru University Parkway, on December 30, 2012 (34 months).

Minor Strengths

- The first delivered Segment, which is Lehi Main to Pleasant Grove Blvd, will be completed for public use by June 30, 2012, providing early completion of a useable portion of the Project in a high traffic volume area of the corridor.
- Keeping Provo Center Street open during construction. This is a minor strength as FSZ there are 240 days of partial closures and 10-30 days of full ramp closures at each ramp.
- The US6/ Spanish Fork Main improvements associated with the Project Work's extended scope improve regional mobility.

Minor Weaknesses

- · Given the schedule for completion of Segments 1 and 2, there are a number of intermediary benefits that may not be accrued by the public until completion.
- Did not divide the Project into more than two useable portions (i.e. Segments).
- Did not provide an MOT Phasing Plan or narrative section. Having an MOT Phasing Plan was key to the evaluation. The selection of a CFI at University Parkway/Sandhill Road, which allows construction to be completed in one

Significant Weaknesses

Significant Weaknesses

Significant Weaknesses

Significant Weaknesses

### **MEDIUM - PRC**

#### SCHEDULE COMPATIBILITY

Evaluation Criteria - Compatibility of the schedule with contractual and proposal elements, such as:

- o Right of way schedule
- o Permits
- o Maximum Payment Curve
- o High Risk Utility relocations
- o Third Party Agreements

Edit Facts

• Contract Requirements:

NTP1: 01/14/10 NTP2: 03/20/10

Project Completion: 01/29/13 Final Punch listing: 04/29/13 Final Acceptance: 04/29/13

UDOT Review Initial Baseline Schedule: 7 days UDOT Review Initial Schedule of Values: 7 days

UDOT Review Stage 1 of Quality Management Plan: 7 days Issue Performance Bond: 01/4/10

Issue Payment Bond: 01/4/10

UDOT Review Baseline Schedule: 10 days; 04/19/10 UDOT Review Schedule of Values: 10 days; 04/19/10 UDOT Review Quality Management Plan: 10 days; 04/19/10

Design Completion: 05/11/11



黟

Significant Strengths Minor Strengths Minor Weaknesses

- Administrative nonconformance:
- Last Segment Completion of 12/30/2012 includes Work during the winter season.
- States 7 days for UDOT review of Initial Baseline, Initial SOV, and Quality Management Plan, starting on 01/14; Contract requires 14 days starting on 01/15.
- Schedule shows concurrent approval of Baseline Schedule and SOV but is almost impossible (SOV is a derivative to the schedule). Schedule assumes single review prior to approval for Baseline Schedule, SOV, and QMP, highly
- Contract requires Payment and Performance Bonds on 12/18/09, schedule shows provided on 01/04/10.
- Schedule shows multiple construction activities (utility relocations) starting prior to NTP2, Contract does not allow.
- Utility Work design times for RMP, Questar, and Qwest are less than what has been agreed to by the Owner and included in the Contract Documents.
- Schedule is incompatible with proposal elements: Schedule shows 2 segments, one of which has 3 subsections (2 or 4 total); proposal lists 2 segment managers, and 2 segment offices but organization chart shows project organized into 3 groups.

### LOW - PRC

#### **PROJECT MANAGEMENT COSTS**

**Evaluation Criteria** — Department project management cost savings as a result of a shorter Project completion schedule

22.6 months of Department project management cost savings.



3.3.1 Completion Deadlines

"By completing nearly two years ahead of schedule UDOT will realize a significant savings in labor and a significant decrease in user costs"

- Edit Significant Strengths Minor Strengths Minor Weaknesses
  - · Administrative nonconformance: - Last Segment Completion of 12/30/2012 includes Work during the winter season.
  - States 7 days for UDOT review of Initial Baseline, Initial SOV, and Quality Management Plan, starting on 01/14; Contract requires 14 days starting on 01/15.
  - Schedule shows concurrent approval of Baseline Schedule and SOV but is almost impossible (SOV is a derivative to the schedule). Schedule assumes single review prior to approval for Baseline Schedule, SOV, and QMP, highly unlikely.
  - Contract requires Payment and Performance Bonds on 12/18/09, schedule shows provided on 01/04/10.
  - Schedule shows multiple construction activities (utility relocations) starting prior to NTP2, Contract does not allow.
  - Utility Work design times for RMP, Questar, and Qwest are less than what has been agreed to by the Owner and included in the Contract Documents.
  - Schedule is incompatible with proposal elements: Schedule shows 2 segments, one of which has 3 subsections (2 or 4 total); proposal lists 2 segment managers, and 2 segment offices but organization chart shows project organized into 3 groups.